UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ML

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,336	08/27/2003	Michael Gadd	17087/002001	4679

7590 03/21/2007

ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.
Suite 2800
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, TX 77010

EXAMINER	
HAN, QI	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,336	GADD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Qi Han	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *32-65* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *32-62* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *63-65* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment dated 12/20/2006. The applicant(s) cancelled all examined claims 1-24, withdrew claims 25-31, and added new claims 32-65 (see the amendment: pages 2-9), which are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection (see below).

Election/Restrictions

3. Newly submitted claims 63-65 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

Regarding new added claims 63-65, they are drawn to an invention that combines features of inventions I and II together as a single claim, which is distinct from invention groups I and II that have separate utility respectively, as described in the previous office action (see detail in the previous office action fined on 04/18/2006).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits (also see Response to Election / Restriction Filed 05/17/2006). Accordingly,

claims 63-65 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

In addition, it is noted that the newly added claims 63-65 have the same or similar situation as previous added claim 31, which had been withdrawn from consideration by the examiner and the corresponding requirement for electing/restricting the original claims into two distinct invention Groups I and II was made **FINAL** (see the previous office action filed on 07/25/2006). The applicant should not ignore the examiner's final requirement of the election/restriction, without any explanation. Further, since the restriction for claims 63-65 is based on the same or similar reason described the previous office action filed on 07/25/2006, this requirement of election/restriction for **claims 63-65** is deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 57-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 60, it recites "computer readable medium comprising executable instructions", which is substantially directed to computer implemented method steps, i.e. functional descriptive material per se, wherein the term "executable instructions" is not necessary to be "computer executable instructions", so that the claim does not fall within the statutory classes. In addition, it is noted that, functional descriptive material per se (i.e. abstract

idea) does not produce a useful, tangible, and concrete result in a practical application. Therefore, the claim, as whole, is directed to non-statutory subject matter (see Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility: ANNEX IV, 1300 Off. Gazette Patent Office 142, 11/22/2005).

Regarding claims 61-62, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 60, because these dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 60.

Regarding claim 57, it claims "a method", which appears, in the surface, to fall within statutory classes (i.e. a process). However, by reviewing the body of the claimed language, it claims nothing more than computer implemented method steps, which, as whole, is substantially directed to functional descriptive material per se and falls within 35 USC 101 Judicial Exceptions, i.e. abstract idea (also evidenced by referring to claim 60). Further, since the claim, as whole, is drawn to functional descriptive material per se (i.e. abstract idea), it does not produce a useful, tangible, and concrete result in a practical application. Therefore, the claim, as whole, is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 58-59, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 57, because these dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 57.

5. To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejection under 35 U.S.C 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 32-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 32, the limitation "in notation independent form" is indefinite because it is unclear what the limitation really means. It is noted that the specification only repeats the same words (see the specification: paragraph 33), but has no specific definition or description for the claimed terms. It is also noted that the claimed limitation is not commonly accepted and/or used terms in the art.

Regarding claims 33-56, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 32, because these dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitations as claim 32.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 38, 41-43, 47, 49 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 38, the limitation "**probability profiles**" in the newly added claim introduces new subject matter, which is not specifically described in the original specification (see the closest disclosure of the specification: paragraph 84).

Regarding claim 41, the limitation "**grammar independent form**" in the newly added claim introduces new subject matter, which is not specifically described in the original specification (see the closest disclosure of the specification: paragraph 82).

Regarding claims 42-43, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 41 because the dependent claims include the same or similar problematic limitation(s) as claim 41.

Regarding claim 47, the limitation "updating operates while the spoken language interface operates" in the newly added claim introduces new subject matter, which is not specifically described in the original specification (see the closest disclosure of the specification: paragraph 86).

Regarding claim 49, the limitation "the application managers are mutually interactive such that activity by a user in one application may result in activity in another application" introduces new subject matter, which is not specifically described in the original specification.

Regarding claim 53, the limitation "determining a **position** of the user and for modifying data provided to the user in accordance with the **position**" introduces new subject matter, which is not specifically described in the original specification (see the specification: paragraph 88, wherein the applicant's defined/described term "position" is nothing to do with the claimed term "location").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 32, 34-35, 37-49, 52-53, 55-58 and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by COFFMAN et al. (US 7,137,126 B1) hereinafter referenced as

As per **claim 32**, as best understood in view of the rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd, (see above), COFFMAN discloses 'conversational computing via conversational virtual machine personality (title), providing 'a universal coordinated multi-modal conversational user interface' across a plurality of 'conversational applications' (abstract), comprising:

"an automatic speech recognition system (ASR) for recognizing speech inputs from a user", (col. 3, lines 57-67, 'conversational subsystems (which may be local or distributed) including speech recognition'; also see Fig. 6);

"a speech generation system for providing speech to be delivered to the user", (col. 3, lines 57-67, 'conversational subsystems (which may be local or distributed) including ...text-to-speech'; also see Fig. 6);

"a database storing data speech constructs configured to carry out a conversation for use by the automatic speech recognition system and the speech generation system, the data speech constructs comprising prompts and grammars stored in notation independent form", (col. 15, line

55 to col. 16, line 48, 'meta-information repository (interpreted as database)' that collects all the information typically assumed known in a conversation interaction...', 'translate input and output to and from the dialog manager 219 to database queries'; col. 22, lines 4-32, 'the context stack 405' and 'data file 413' (can also be interpreted as database) including 'vocabulary file, language model, ...tags, voice print (corresponding to prompts), TTS rule, grammar...' (corresponding to data speech constructs); Fig.4 show the subsystems are structurally and functionally separated, which is interpreted as independent form as claimed; col. 11, line 11 and col. 12, lines 21, 'user prompt', 'foundation classes (inherently having parameters, values)' including 'Request_confirmation (for prompt)');

"a controller for controlling the automatic speech recognition system, the speech generation system and the database", (col. 18, lines 50-55, 'CVM controller'; Fig.4 and col. 22, lines 47-67, 'CVM 401', 'task dispatcher/controller' and 'dialog controller', wherein each of them can be read on claimed controller; col. 15, lines 29-43, 'conversation manager' and 'CPU', each of them can also be read on claimed controller); and

"a voice user interface provided between the user and one or more applications", (Figs 5-6, 'conversational UI' including 'VUI (voice user interface)') ; and

"at least one further user interface, the further user interface comprising a non-voice user interface", (Figs 5-6, 'conversational UI' including 'GUI (graphic user interface-- non-voice user interface)');

"wherein the controller is configured to manage synchronous conversations between the user and the computer system across a voice channel provided by the voice user interface and at least one non-voice channel provided by the at least one further user interface", (col. 8, lines 21-

63, 'synchronization between a GUI modality and a speech modality'; col. 9, lines 1-15, 'provides a universal coordinated multi-modal conversational user interface (CUI)' for 'various I/O resources such as voice, keyboard,...touch screen' and 'speech + GUI'; col. 15, lines 29-49, 'managing the dialog (conversational dialog comprising speech and multi modal I/O such as GUI keyboard, pointer, mouse, video input etc)').

As per **claim 34** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "a workflow manager for managing transitions between workflow components stored in the database" (col. 34, lines 36-50, 'the task (workflow) dispatcher/controller 402 divides each command/process into multiple actions, starts the associated threads/processes with the context stack 405 (interpreted as database)' and allocates each resource and shares them between spawned actions, and controls handles and streams to the appropriate conversational subsystems...'; col. 34, lines 5-30, 'the task dispatcher/controller 402' to 'handle multiple simultaneous tasks' and 'the issue of maintaining the dialog flow'; col. 23, line 46 to col. 24, line 10, 'dialog controller manages the dialog across all the conversational and conventional applications', performing 'function of dialog manager' with 'different tasks' and 'exchanging information between local parallel applications').

As per **claim 35** (depending on claim 34), COFFMAN further discloses:

"a prompt component comprising a dialogue spoken to a user", (col. 10, line 65, 'spoken prompt');

"actions representing an action performed as a consequence of user dialogue", (col. 21, lines 41-44, 'converting conversational and conventional input streams into multiple actions ...'; col. 30, lines 7-10, 'spawn multiple actions' including executing task...') ;

"parameters comprising information to be elicited from a user", (col. 4, lines 11-12, 'query arguments (parameters)'; col. 22, lines 10-15);

"words comprising possible values for parameters", (col. 22, lines 10-15, 'arguments list of attribute value n-(t)uples' ; col. 39, lines 44-46, 'arguments of function calls with the sequence of words...'); and

"phrases comprising a set of related prompts and possible user responses", (col. 16, lines 7-11, 'dialog prompts (introduction, questions, feedback etc)'; col. 31, lines 2-7, 'generate a request (a prompt) for missing or ambiguous information and update the context (requested missing fields', which implies user responses as claimed).

As per **claim 37** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "the database stores mappings between keywords and system functionality" (col. 9, lines 39-60, 'the conventional applications 12 are managed by the CVM kernel layer 14...for accessing commands (corresponding to keywords) of the conventional applications as well as the underlying OS commands', 'converting (mapping) voice requests into queries and converting output and results into spoken messages using the appropriated data files 17 (e.g. contexts, finite state grammars, vocabularies, ...symbolic query maps (mappings) etc.)' (corresponding to database); also see col. 17, lines 61-67 and col. 31, lines 53-67).

As per **claim 38** (depending on claim 32), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st, (see above), COFFMAN further discloses "the database stores statistical information automatically adapting automatic speech recognition system probability profiles" (col. 22, lines 39-60, 'HMM (hidden markov models)', which necessarily and/or inherently includes the claimed feature).

As per **claim 39** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "automatically generates a spoken language interface personality based on user demographics" (col. 35, lines 16-22, 'conversational customization', 'the personality/behavior of the CVM can be automatically customized to an identified user's preferences'; also see Figs. 1 and 4, blocks 17 and 413 and col. 13, lines 60-67).

As per **claim 40** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "a hybrid rule based and stochastic natural language processing engine configured to automatically recognize user responses or dynamically generate system prompts based on conversational context" (col. 22, lines 4-32, 'the context stacks', 'performing their respect tasks such as ...HMM (hidden markov models ---stochastic/statistic processing), language models, TTS rules, grammar (rule based processing)...', which is read on the claim).

As per **claim 41** (depending on claim 32), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st, (see above), COFFMAN further discloses "constructs and user utterances for which the automatic speech recognition system listens, wherein the data speech constructs are stored [in grammar independent form]" (col. 22, lines 39-60, 'vocabulary, HMM (hidden markov models), voiceprint (user utterance), language models or possible queries for a speech input, which necessarily and/or inherently includes the claimed feature).

As per **claim 42** (depending on claim 41), COFFMAN further discloses "prompts or recorded voice delivered by the automatic speech generator to the user" (col. 18, lines 50-64, 'voice prints', 'baseforms and voice fonts', 'TTS').

As per **claim 43** (depending on claim 41), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 34, because the rejection for claim 34 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 43.

As per **claim 44** (depending on claim 32), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 39, because the rejection for claim 39 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 44, wherein 'conversational customization' and 'the personality/behavior' are read on claimed user profile.

As per **claim 45** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "an adaptive learning unit, the adaptive learning unit being responsive to historical transactions between the spoken language interface and a given user to automatically customize the dialogue with the given user" (col. 16, lines 18-48, 'global history 216...stores...information that associated with all the applications and actions taking during a conversational session'; col. 30, 'content stack can be traversed...finding and selecting the active discourses between the user and machine among the last and past discourses, possible going back into the history'; col. 36, lines 5-20, 'dialogs, categories, meta-information, and access to resources can be a function of the identify of the user and its associated meta-information history'; col. 49, lines 36-39, 'the user meta-information is one of the provided directed by the user, learned (adaptive learning) from past usage of the system by the user, and combination thereof').

As per **claim 46** (depending on claim 44), COFFMAN further discloses "the personalization unit is connected between the database and the controller" (Figs. 1 and 4, blocks 17 and 14, 413 and 414).

As per **claim 47** (depending on claim 44), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st, (see above), COFFMAN further discloses "updating the data speech constructs, wherein the means for updating operates while the spoken language interface operates" (col. 31, lines 65-67, 'the context stack (including data speech constructs) is updated pending on (while operating) voice (corresponding to spoken language interface), keyboard, mouse or any other input or command and on the application output'; col. 36, lines 10-12, 'the meta-information (including data speech constructs) ...can be...updated before and after each action ore access'; col. 38, lines 2-7, 'in particular dialog structures, each system can ...update the skeleton meta-information').

As per **claim 48** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "interfaces to a plurality of applications, providing the user with voice access to each application, and an application manager for each application, wherein each application manager comprises an internal representation of the application" (Fig. 6, showing multi-modal (multiple interfaces) and the corresponding repetitions; and col. 20, lines 8-67, 'different dialog managers' and 'different applications will have their own dialog manager').

As per **claim 49** (depending on claim 48), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 1st (see above), COFFMAN further discloses "mutually interactive such that activity by a user in one application may result in activity in another application" (Fig. 6 and col. 20, lines 8-67, 'information exchange (interactive activity) between dialog managers', 'the different dialog managers will negotiate a topology with a master dialog manager and slave or peer dialog managers').

As per **claim 52** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "a notification manager for notifying the user of preselected events" (col. 20, lines 8-67, 'information exchange' including 'notification of I/O events...'notification of recognition events...', wherein the mechanism handling the notifications is read on notification manager).

As per **claim 53** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "a location manager for determining a position of the user and for modifying data provided to the user in accordance with the position" (col. 42, lines 33-39, 'guide you turn by turn to the store', 'you position is computed, location of the store is fetched' and 'an itinerary is computed (implying modifying data) to take into account the latest traffic information', wherein the mechanism handling the location/itinerary is read on location manager).

As per **claim 55** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "the voice channel and the at least one non-voice channel are provided by one device." (Figs. 6-7 and 12, blocks 708-710).

As per **claim 56** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN further discloses "the voice channel and the at least one non-voice channel are provided by different devices" (Figs. 6-7 and 12, blocks 600-603).

As per **claim 57**, it recites a method of handling dialogues. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 32, because the rejection for claim 32 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 57.

As per **claim 58** (depending on claim 57), COFFMAN further discloses "prior to marking a phrase as complete, prompting the user to confirm details given to the computer system" (col.

31, lines 50-60, 'if the request (including phrase) is complete, it will be executed, pending possible request for confirmation by the user...', which is read on the claim).

As per **claim 60**, it recites a computer readable medium. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 57, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 57.

As per **claim 61** (depending on claim 60), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 58, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 58.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of MAES. (US 6,970, 935 B1).

As per **claim 33** (depending on claim 32), even though COFFMAN discloses that "the at least one non-voice interface comprises a World Wide Web (www) interface" (col. 37, lines 40-50, 'web browsing' through 'conventional browser (corresponding to www interface) modality' to 'display the information', COFFMAN does not expressly disclose "a Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) interface". However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by MAES who discloses 'conversational networking via transport, cording and control conversational protocols' (title), comprising 'the conversational protocols' that may be implemented on top to HTTP' or 'WAP (wireless application protocol)' (col. 6, lines 56-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN by providing a conversational protocols including WAP, as

taught by MAES, for the purpose (motivation) of providing equivalent lightweight transport protocol to use on wireless networks (MAES: col. 6, lines 65-66).

10. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of TESSEL et al. (US 7,016,847 B1) hereinafter referenced as TESSEL.

As per **claim 36** (depending on claim 35), COFFMAN does not expressly disclose whether the prompt can be "static" or "dynamic", or both. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by TESSEL who discloses 'open architecture for a voice user interface' (title), and teaches that 'a prompt can be static, or it can be news stories or other audio data that was recorded dynamically' and 'both types of prompts...can be played directly' (col. 12, lines 5-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN by providing capability of playing both static and dynamic prompts, as taught by TESSEL, for the purpose (motivation) of providing prompts in different situations, such as the data being variable and the data being stored as built-in (TESSEL: col. 12, lines 15-18).

11. Claims 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of KUO et al. (US 6,418,440 B1) hereinafter referenced as KUO.

As per **claim 50** (depending on claim 35), COFFMAN further discloses "a session manager connected to the controller for managing user sessions" (col. 16, lines 49-67, 'the CVM system' comprising using 'conversational protocols 204' and 'the communication stack 214' that is 'implemented by connection with the well-known OSI protocol layers', including a session

layer', which necessarily and/or inherently have a mechanism for managing user sessions as claimed), but does not expressly disclose "the session manager being arranged to monitor a user conversation, whereby if a break in that conversation occurs, the user can be reconnected at the same point in the conversation". However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by KUO who discloses system and method for performing automated dynamic dialogue generation (title), comprising 'dialog manager' monitoring the dialog (conversation) and user behavior and 'profile manager' monitoring 'subsequent dialogue sessions' (col. 5, lines 4-43); 'dialogue manager' to 'control the dialogue flow' and 'log system and dialogue information' to 'trace dialogue sessions' (col. 10, lines 19-24); col. 10, lines 48-55, functioning 'dialogue history, and keeping a log of dialogue sessions', and 'go back (reconnect) to a previous part (at the same point in the conversation) of the session' (col. 10, lines 48-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN by specifically providing a mechanism for monitoring dialog sessions and handling to go back to a previous part of the session, as taught by KUO, for the purpose (motivation) of being more efficient and more readily for modifying user's application and updating requested services and information (KUO: col. 5, lines 55-57).

As per **claim 51** (depending on claim 50), COFFMAN in view of KUO further discloses "the break in the user conversation occurs due to an event selected from one of a loss in a connection and a switch of application by the user" (COFFMAN; col. 20, lines 25-49, 'information can be exchanged... interrupted (break in the user conversation occurs) action (event)'; KUO: col. 10, lines 53-55, 'the dialog becomes stuck (corresponding break)').

12. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN in view of PETRECCA et al. (US 5,781,894) hereinafter referenced as PETRECCA.

As per **claim 54** (depending on claim 32), COFFMAN does not expressly disclose "an advertising manager for, at the choice of the user, selectively displaying advertisements to the user in accordance with one or more predetermined parameters". However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by PETRECCA who discloses 'method and system for advertising on personal computer' (title), comprising 'advertising messages' being displayed and 'an activating system' that 'gives the consumer (user) the choice to (selectively) view the advertisements' (col. 1, lines 43-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify COFFMAN by specifically providing a mechanism of handling and displaying advertisements, as taught by PETRECCA, for the purpose (motivation) of enabling sponsors to present advertisements or commercials to a user when using computer (PETRECCA: abstract).

13. Claims 59 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COFFMAN.

As per **claim 59** (depending on claim 58), COFFMAN does not expressly disclose "when the user does not confirm the details in the affirmative, asking the user to select a desired parameter value, resetting the desired parameter value to empty; and playing a prompt to elicit a value from the user for the empty parameter values". However, COFFMAN discloses that 'if the user rejects...his/her input prior to execution or notification of execution to the user, the input is appended to the active utterances and the search is re-started' (not confirm the details in the

affirmative) and the system can 'generate a request (a prompt) for the missing or ambiguous information and update the context' (col. 31, lines 1-7 and 50-67); providing a universal coordinated multi-modal conversational user interface (CUI)' with 'speech+GUI' (col. 9, lines 1-15); using 'conversational foundation classes', 'dialog objects' and 'conversational gesture messages' that is 'rendered as a displayed string or spoken prompt' with 'CML (conversational markup language)' (col. 10, lines 35-67); 'examples of some conversational foundation classes' include 'Request_confirmation...Correct-input...Listen_to_TTS...Listen_to_playback' (col. 11, line 23 to col. 12, line 67); 'voice input...can be arguments (parameters) of function calls' and the results 'derived classes in a object-oriented context' (col. 39, lines 43-49); and the conversational example with CUI and PDA (col. 42, lines 1-39), which suggests that the system has capability of implementing the functionality as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that receiving new input would initiate a new object (or function call) that necessarily resets/initiates corresponding variable(s) (parameter value being empty) and assigning the variable(s) for the new input data, and to combine the different teachings from COFFMAN by providing further conversational dialog actions for receiving new input data and prompting the corresponding information, as suggested by COFFMAN, for the purpose (motivation) of using the conversational user interface for system dialog with user to complete, disambiguate, summarize or correct queries and the result of the executions (COFFMAN: col. 15-19).

As per **claim 62** (depending on claim 61), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 59, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 59.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria , VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

QH/qh
March 15, 2007

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER